

AMENDMENTS

Claims 1-9 and 12-21 are pending.

Claims 7-8 and 16-17 have been amended.

Claims 10-11 have been cancelled.

Support for the amendments is found in the claims and specification (page 14, second paragraph) as filed. No new matter is believed to have been added.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS AND REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

The rejection of claims 1-6, 9, 12-14, and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Nagasawa et al., WO 00/73351, (page reference below is made to US counterpart patent 6,541,614) is traversed because Nagasawa et al. do not describe selecting a cellulose ether as a backbone for polysaccharide derivatives, wherein the cellulose ether has an average molecular weight of 100,000 to 600,000 or 100,000 to 200,000 (see present claims 1 and 13). Nagasawa et al. do not describe the claimed molecular weight of the cellulose ether in combination with “n” being from 10-20 (see present claims 12, 14, and 20-21) and hydroxyethylcellulose having the claimed average molecular weight (see present claim 3).

Nagasawa et al. describe a general formula of polysaccharide derivatives having hydrogen atoms in the hydrogen groups substituted with a group of formula (1), wherein “n” is represented by a broad range of from 8 to 300 (col. 1-2). Nagasawa et al. further disclose that an average molecular weight (“MW”) of the starting polysaccharide or its derivative is represented by a broad range of from 10,000 to 10,000,000, 100,000 to 5,000,000, and 300,000 to 2,000,000 (col. 5, lines 24-26).

“When the compound is not specifically named, but instead it is necessary to select portions of teachings within a reference and combine them, e.g., select various substituents from a list of alternatives given for placement at specific sites on a generic chemical formula to arrive at a specific composition, anticipation can only be found if the classes of substituents are sufficiently limited or well delineated. *Ex parte A*, 17 USPQ2d 1716 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990). If one of ordinary skill in

the art is able to “at once envisage” the specific compound within the generic chemical formula, the compound is anticipated. One of ordinary skill in the art must be able to draw the structural formula or write the name of each of the compounds included in the generic formula before any of the compounds can be “at once envisaged.” One may look to the preferred embodiments to determine which compounds can be anticipated. *In re Petering*, 301 F.2d 676, 133 USPQ 275 (CCPA 1962) (emphasis added).

Compare *In re Meyer*, 599 F.2d 1026, 202 USPQ 175 (CCPA 1979) (A reference disclosing “alkaline chlorine or bromine solution” embraces a large number of species and cannot be said to anticipate claims to “alkali metal hypochlorite.”); *Akzo N.V. v. International Trade Comm’n*, 808 F.2d 1471, 1 USPQ2d 1241 (Fed. Cir. 1986) (Claims to a process for making aramid fibers using a 98% solution of sulfuric acid were not anticipated by a reference which disclosed using sulfuric acid solution but which did not disclose using a 98% concentrated sulfuric acid solution.).” See MPEP § 2131.02

Nagasawa et al. specifically describe compounds that differ from those claimed. For example, Example 1 describes hydroxyethylcellulose having an average MW about 800,000 and “n” being 50 (col. 10); Example 6 describes hydroxyethylcellulose having an average MW of 1,500,000 and “n” being 12; Example 7 describes hydroxyethylcellulose having an average MW of 1,500,000 and “n” being 19; Example 8 describes hydroxyethylcellulose having an average MW of 800,000 and “n” being 20; Comparative Example 1 describes hydroxyethylcellulose having an average MW of 800,000, Comparative Example 2 describes methylcellulose having an average MW of 300,000; and Comparative Example 3 describes hydroxyethylcellulose having an average MW of 1,500,000 and “n” being 3 (see col. 10-14).

In addition, the compounds of Comparative Examples 1 and 2 do not have side chains (even though hydroxyethylcellulose of Comparative Example 2 has MW within the claimed range), which is not within the scope of the present invention which requires hydrogen atoms in the hydroxy groups of the cellulose ether backbone to be substituted (see present claim 1).

Nagasawa et al. do not teach or suggest selecting a *specific* cellulose ether having an average MW of 100,000 to 600,000 or 100,000 to 200,000 (see present claims 1 and 13) and the claimed molecular weight of the cellulose ether in combination with “n” being from 10-

20 (see present claims 12 and 14). Nagasawa et al. also do not teach or suggest selecting hydroxyethylcellulose having an average MW of 100,000 to 600,000 (see present claim 3).

Nagasawa et al. do not describe a polysaccharide comprising agent being an aerosol and a face mask, a sheet and a cosmetic product comprising the claimed allergen inactivating agent.

Thus, Nagasawa et al. do not anticipate the claimed allergen inactivating agent comprising polysaccharide derivatives.

Nagasawa et al. do not make the claimed agent obvious because the allergen inactivating effect of the Nagasawa polysaccharides would not have been expected. The polysaccharides having the claimed ranges of molecular weight advantageously provide the allergen inactivating effect that is quite different from the thickening effect of Nagasawa.

Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 7-8 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Nagasawa et al. and Golz-Berner et al., US 6,245,342, is traversed because the combination of the references does not describe or suggest a face mask and a sheet for the face mask comprising the claimed allergen inactivating agent.

The disclosure of Nagasawa et al. is discussed above. Nagasawa et al. do not describe or suggest a face mask or sheet. Golz-Berner et al. do not cure the deficiency.

Golz-Berner et al. describe a cosmetic preparation comprising a melanogenesis-stimulating and an anti-inflammatory peptide and, optionally, hydroxyethylcellulose which can be applied to a hair mask (col. 3, line 15). The Examiner is of the opinion that one would have been motivated to substitute hydroxyethylcellulose in the anti-inflammatory hair mask of Golz-Berner et al. with the claimed allergenic inactivating agent comprising the polysacchiride derivatives in a face mask (*see* page 6, of the Official Action). We disagree.

One would not have been motivated to apply an allergen inactivating agent to a hair mask because an allergic reaction usually onsets when an allergen is contacted with the skin or eyes or is inhaled, i.e., applying an anti-allergen to hair does not make sense, while applying an allergen inactivating agent to a face mask prevents inhaling the allergen.

The Golz-Berner et al. melanogenesis-stimulating and anti-inflammatory peptides act through a direct contact with the skin. The skin is stimulated through the metabolism taking place with the involvement of AMPc, which is activated by the peptides and xanthine (col. 3, lines 60-64). The peptide derivatives, especially MAPX, stimulate melanine synthesis (col. 3, lines 60-64). The semisynthetic peptides regenerate the connective tissue (col. 3, lines 60-64). The protective and regenerative effect consists first of the light protective effect caused by newly formed melanin, which plays the role of a natural UV filter (col. 3, line 65, to col. 4, line5). It is also consists of the regeneration of UV-damaged cells by modulation of cytokinins IL-1 and TFNs, as well as a synergistic effect of all peptides present in the preparation with respect to free radicals (col. 3, line 65, to col. 4, line5).

The present specification describes that conventional masks for pollinosis are associated with the risk that symptoms of allergic diseases may be induced when the pollen, mite, or other allergen that has been captured by the mask is released from the mask and inhaled by the patient. In contrast, the mask and the sheet for the mask of the present invention have the merit that such allergic symptoms are less likely to be induced even if the allergen that had been captured was released from the mask since the captured allergen is detoxidated as soon as it is captured by the mask. *See* page 14, last paragraph.

Thus, the combination of Nagasawa et al. and Golz-Berner et al. do not make the claimed invention obvious. Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 6 and 15, directed to an aerosol-like allergen inactivating agent, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Nagasawa et al and Palinczar, US 4,671,955. The rejection is

traversed because the combination of the references does not describe (1) selecting a cellulose ether as a backbone for polysaccharide derivatives, wherein the cellulose ether has an average molecular weight of 100,000 to 600,000 or 100,000 to 200,000, and (2) the claimed molecular weight of the cellulose ether in combination with "n" being from 10-20 and hydroxyethylcellulose having the claimed average molecular weight.

The disclosure of Nagasawa et al. is set forth above. Nagasawa et al. do not describe the claimed limitations (1) and (2) mentioned above. Palinczar does not cure the deficiency.

Palinczar describes using ethyl hydroxyethyl cellulose in aerosols (col., 3, lines 5-12), but does not describe selecting the claimed cellulose ether as a backbone for polysaccharide derivatives, wherein the cellulose ether has an average molecular weight of 100,000 to 600,000 or 100,000 to 200,000, and the claimed molecular weight of the cellulose ether in combination with "n" being from 10-20 and hydroxyethylcellulose having the claimed average molecular weight.

Nagasawa et al. and Palinczar do not make the claimed agent obvious because the allergen inactivating effect of the Nagasawa polysaccharides would not have been expected. The polysaccharides having the claimed ranges of molecular weight advantageously provide the allergen inactivating effect that is quite different from the thickening effect of Nagasawa.

Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

A Notice of Allowance for all pending claims is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon



Marina I. Miller, Ph.D.
Registration No. 59,091

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)